



Town Meeting



Bulletin OF AMERICA'S
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
Sponsored by THE READER'S DIGEST

Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?

Acting Moderator, J. RAYMOND WALSH

Speakers

CARL HATCH
WALTER H. JUDD

JESSIE SUMNER
ELY CULBERTSON

(See also page 12)

C O M I N G J U L Y 1 2 t h

Should the Government Assure Jobs?

(PREVIEW IN THIS ISSUE—See page 22)

About the goal there can be little debate. There should be a job for every American who wants to work—a job that he can do effectively and that will provide him a living wage. But whose is the responsibility of seeing that jobs are at hand? Can industry reach the desired goal? Must Government assume ultimate responsibility and act when industry lags?

TUNE IN EVERY THURSDAY, AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY—8:30 p.m., E.W.T.

★ ★ ★ CONTENTS ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 28:

"Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?"

Mr. WALSH	3
Senator HATCH	4
Mr. CULBERTSON	6
Congressman JUDD	7
Congresswoman SUMNER	9
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16

THE BROADCAST OF JULY 5:

"Should We Have Universal Military Training After the War?"

(PREVIEW IN BULLETIN OF JULY 21)

THE BROADCAST OF JULY 12:

"Should the Government Assure Jobs?"

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW	22
----------------------------	----

The Broadcast of July 28, 1945, originated at Mitchel Field, Long Island, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., Eastern War Time, over American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published weekly by *The Reader's Digest*. Town Meeting Publication Office: 32 South Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1897.



Town Meeting



Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air



George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator

Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?

Announcer:

The Reader's Digest, America's most widely read magazine, welcomes you to another exciting session of America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of issues affecting your life and mine.

Tonight, here before an all-GI audience at the great Mitchel Field, Long Island, Army Air Base, four outstanding authorities clash over the most vital question of our times, "Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?" And now to open this crucial discussion, *The Reader's Digest* brings you the noted radio commentator and author, Raymond Walsh, who will act as guest moderator tonight while George V. Denny, Jr., founder of America's Town Meeting, enjoys a well-earned rest. Mr. Walsh. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Walsh:

Good evening, friends. Tonight we are the guests of Major General Frank O. D. Hunter, Commanding General of the First Air Force, and Colonel E. E. Hildreth,

Commanding Officer of Mitchel Field, and the thousands of highly-trained flying men and Air WACS at the Army's great Mitchel Field Air Base near New York City.

America's Town Meeting feels honored to be the first discussion program ever broadcast from a military base in this country, where Army personnel will express their opinions.

The air above is swarming with war planes. Some are speeding our wounded home from European battlefields. Others are pausing briefly here on their beeline to the Pacific to blast Japan into unconditional surrender.

Tonight before this audience of servicemen and women, we are to discuss what may prove to be the most important question of our lifetime—"Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?" Just signed by President Truman and brought direct to Washington by Senators Connally and Vandenburg for presentation to the Senate, the San Francisco Charter is the climax of the world-rousing series of meet-

ings at Teheran, Dumbarton Oaks, and Yalta.

The Charter is the supreme effort of the leaders of fifty nations, representing hundreds of millions of human beings, to work out a formula in which the nations of the world can live in peace with each other, and also develop better standards of life in a larger freedom.

Our first speaker is the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Carl A. Hatch, who will be supported in the affirmative by Representative Walter H. Judd, Congressman from Minnesota.

On the negative we have famed author and lecturer, Ely Culbertson, and Representative Jessie Sumner of Illinois. First let's hear from Senator Carl A. Hatch. Senator Hatch. (*Applause.*)

Senator Hatch:

My answer to the question, "Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?" is positive and unequivocal. It consists of one word. That word is "Yes."

The Charter does set up machinery by which nations may settle disputes without resort to war.

It does establish a court of international justice.

It does include procedures for the study and solution of social and economic problems which have always contained dangerous possibilities of things which lead to war.

It does outlaw aggression on the part of any nation.

These and others are positive agencies leading toward peace. They dare not be discarded by us

who have led the world into the adoption of the Charter. For two long weary months delegates of the nations, including our own, labored over the perplexing problems of what might or might not be agreed upon. This Charter presented to the Senate next week, is the final result of all their labors.

During the course of tonight's discussion objection to the Charter or some of its provisions will be made. Some people say its provisions are too strong. That it creates a supergovernment. Others, that it is too weak—not strong enough. Unfortunately, no one of us, and no one nation can write an agreement exactly as that person, or that nation might want to have it. That was the situation with which our delegates at San Francisco were confronted. Differences had to be reconciled.

The plan which our delegates brought back to us represents the best efforts of the combined minds of all the world, and the culmination of generations of thought and effort towards this goal. It is a good plan. It is a workable plan. It will be accepted by the Senate. Thereafter, America will take her place in world affairs in times of peace as vigorously and as bravely as she participates in times of war. (*Applause.*)

In the Senate yesterday, when Senator Connally and Senator Vandenburg entered the chamber returning from San Francisco, the Senators present rose to a man and in complete violation of Senate rules cheered the two Senators

loudly and enthusiastically. It was a demonstration such as I have never before witnessed in the Senate, and it augurs well for Senate ratification.

The Charter agreed upon at San Francisco is the only proposal presented to us. Even the plan which our distinguished associate on this program, Mr. Culbertson, has so long advocated and for which he has so earnestly worked is not available for consideration.

Mr. Culbertson's plan does possess merit. In his efforts to secure a stronger world organization for peace he has made a valuable contribution, and that, Mr. Culbertson, is no finesse.

Yet, the unalterable fact remains that we in the Senate, we at least must face the responsibility of acting upon the treaty which is proposed. We are not discussing relative merits of other proposals. It may be well to remember that this is not the first time our Nation has taken the lead in forming a world organization. Once before we led the nations of the world into a league to prevent war, and then we ourselves stayed out. We chose the part of noncooperation. We refused to ratify that treaty, even as some of us would have us refuse today.

We have led the world in forming this, another, treaty. We have asked other nations to follow our leadership. Do we dare now to not follow our own leadership?

Even if amendments and reservations were agreed to in the Senate, is there any reason to believe that other nations would likewise

agree to those amendments and reservations?

Every suggestion that you will hear tonight, and later during the course of Senate debate and public discussion, was considered at San Francisco. Those suggestions were not agreed to there. They do not warrant reconsideration now.

Do you believe, Mr. Culbertson, that other nations are now going to change and accept that which they have already rejected? Isn't it more reasonable to suppose that our rejection of the Charter or substantial amendment will mean that the world has once again failed in its great advantage to organize for peace? This instrument was not conceived to cure all the ills of mankind. It does present the framework, the machinery and procedure, by which in the course of years nations can solve their differences without recourse to war. We cannot afford to risk the failure of world peace. We must take this first step—the initial move—away from war toward peace and accept this Charter. The answer must be yes. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Walsh:

Thank you, Senator Hatch, for your distinguished presentation. Now, for the other side of the case, let's hear what Ely Culbertson has to say. Mr. Culbertson is the well known author of *World Federation* and *The Fight for Total Peace*. Mr. Culbertson. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Culbertson:

I'm sorry, Senator Hatch, that this time I find myself on the opposite side. I've always admired you for your marvelous contributions to the cause of internationalism. But ideals are more important than friendship, so here it goes.

You have stated, Senator, that the San Francisco Charter must be accepted because it is the one and only Charter before us. I don't see the logic of this statement. It reminds me of that poker player who when warned that the game in which he was playing was crooked kept on playing anyway on the ground that it was the one and only game in town.

The San Francisco Charter as it now stands cannot possibly fulfill its stated solemn purpose of security against aggression. How can you prevent or stop aggression when each one of the Big Five nations has the right to veto even an investigation of aggression?

Where is world security when the Charter forbids the use of armed force if the aggressor happens to belong to the exclusive club of the Big Five? This is like having a cop to protect me against petty thieves, but who is forbidden by law to protect me against big gangsters.

The State Department claims that the Charter has teeth. I say, it is a set of false teeth that can bite no one except the little fellows.

As for the principle of the sovereign equality of all states, the

Charter's grandiloquent assembly of United Nations is really an assembly of mice presided over by a few cats. Peace—not war—was vetoed in San Francisco.

The Charter is a system of collective security which is neither collective or secure. A system which can work only when a major state is not an aggressor is the most tragic farce in history. The best proof of it lies in the fact that the same Senate which is preparing to ratify this so-called Charter for lasting peace is also preparing to introduce universal conscription in the United States, while Russia has just passed the largest military budget in her history.

You also say that the Senate has no alternative but to adopt or reject the Charter. I don't see the logic of this either. There is a third way. The Senate has a God-given opportunity to transform this Charter from a timid and hypocritical document of power politics into a ringing challenge to all the war lords of the future.

This can be done very simply by incorporating three indispensable amendments. First, there must be a permanent limitation of the world production of heavy armament with a production quota for each state; second, an international armed force made up of citizens of the smaller states only; third, an international peace authority acting upon a simple majority vote.

These three amendments cannot wait until after the Charter is

adopted. History has imposed upon the American nation a fateful timetable. Today the United States is the mightiest military nation of all times, and has the active goodwill of four-fifths of the world, but we will possess this enormous power for only a few short years. Other nations with greater resources and with overwhelming manpower are rapidly industrializing and soon will catch up with us.

In another fifteen years, Russia, with her vast fields of influence in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, in Communist China, will become a giant state of more than five hundred million people, inevitably outproducing us in fighting machines.

The San Francisco Charter leaves the road wide open to one of two disastrous wars. We are facing within the next five or six years a preventive war by the capitalistic world, led by the United States, to eliminate the threat of the rising Russian giant state. And if this war does not take place, then we are facing, in 15 or 20 years, a war for the control of the world by Communist Eurasia led by Russia.

Either of these two wars will be a catastrophe of centuries. Faith healing will not prevent them. The only escape from both of them is to establish now, while the United States is supreme, an iron-clad system of world security so designed that the United States could not threaten the destruction of Soviet Russia today and Soviet

Russia could not threaten the destruction of the United States tomorrow.

This must be and can be done, for the United States can do today what no other nation has ever done before. It can declare peace on the world and win it. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Walsh:

Thank you, Mr. Culbertson. Now we turn to the affirmative again and have Representative Walter H. Judd, Republican of Minnesota. Dr. Judd has spent years in China as a medical missionary, he knows war at first hand, and he knows the importance of keeping the peace. Dr. Judd. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Judd:

Let us admit frankly that the San Francisco Charter is far from a perfect instrument for establishing justice and enduring peace on this earth. Mr. Culbertson has pointed out some of its defects and I agree it is not as good in some respects as I had hoped—although better than I had expected.

But the fact that it is not as good as we should like does not prove that we should, therefore, reject it. Every time a doctor operates on a malignant disease he realizes fully the dangers involved, but he operates nevertheless because he knows there are even greater dangers if he doesn't operate.

After the last war, we carefully calculated all the risks involved

in going in with other nations to try to establish machinery to prevent war, and the risks were there.

But we failed to evaluate adequately the risks and costs of not going in, and, believe me, those risks and costs were there, too, as every one of you in the armed forces can bear personal testimony.

Therefore, before we reject the Charter because of its obvious defects, let us consider the possible alternatives:

First, we could try to escape the world; go back to so-called isolationism. This is the natural attitude because of the fact that it once was a good way to get security. Our forefathers escaped Europe by coming here, but will someone please suggest where we should go now to escape the world.

Second, we could try to run the world—depend solely on our own control of strategic islands and air bases and a gigantic army and navy and air force. But that could not assure us of long-term security because other nations would unite against us just as we united against those who tried to dominate us. Because we do not have enough minerals or money or manpower, we cannot get around the hard facts that we have only 6 per cent of the earth's land and 6½ per cent of its population.

Third, we could try to buy the world, supply it with food, clothing, machinery, and money in the naive belief that then everybody would love us and we would have no further troubles. But it never has been possible to buy goodwill and it never will be, and again we

simply do not have the resources to sustain any such program.

Well, if we can't escape the world or run the world or buy the world, is there any course left except to join it in a genuine co-operative effort to organize the world for security? That has difficulties, yes. But it also has hope and no other course has.

Thus it seems to me our choice is not between this Charter and something better but between this Charter and nothing, which is worse. The Charter does not settle any of the world's great problems such as boundaries, minorities, access to raw materials, colonies, air routes, and all the rest. Neither did our Constitution solve any of the various conflicts between the thirteen colonies.

What it did do was to set up a mechanism by which conflicts could be solved. That was its strength, not its weakness. This Charter, with all its inadequacy, does provide machinery by which, I think, the nations can settle peaceably the conflicts that exist now and those that will inevitably arise. It is workable if there is the will and good will to make it work and no plan can prevent war if there is not such will and good will.

While I do not believe the Charter is as bad as some would have you think, I also do not believe it is as good as some others portray it to be in their concern to make sure our country will participate this time. I deplore that over-enthusiasm because it will almost certainly lead to over-disillusionment producing

three isolationists where only one grew before.

I was glad to hear our President insist at San Francisco that it is only a *first* step. For example, we recognized frankly that some members of this proposed organization have been and still are engaging in certain practices to which we are utterly opposed. When we accept this Charter, we neither condemn nor condone the conduct of those nations. We merely recognize the practical fact that to join does not endanger any of our legitimate interest and does give more hope of improving relations between nations and thereby of preventing more than if we don't join.

Further, with regard to the very practices we disapprove, there is more chance of doing something about them if we are in than if we are not.

Unquestionably, the success of the new organization and the success of the world will depend largely on whether the Big Five can learn to work together in peace as they have in war. I hope, and I cannot but believe, they will, not primarily because of the sense of moral obligation or of altruism but because of a hardheaded realization that to work together for the security of all is the best way to assure the security of each.

In short, I believe we must actively participate in the organization because the stakes for our future are so great we cannot afford not to join on the best terms it has been possible to get at this time. I recognize the effort

may fail, but it is certain that no other course can succeed.

Therefore, we must try our best because if we don't make a go of it this time, then there is no hope until after World War III. We dare not choose that. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Walsh:

Thank you, Congressman Judah. Now, we turn to the concluding speech on this program of the four main speakers, and we will hear from Representative Jessie Sumner. Once a judge, she is now the Congresswoman from the Illinois District so long represented by a famous speaker of the House, Joe Cannon. Representative Sumner. (*Applause.*)

Congresswoman Sumner:

This Charter is a step in a program of unconstitutional steps surrendering our country to rule by foreign governments. Under it, Russia and France will have power enough to make permanent the present temporary arrangement by which our Government furnishes to Russia and England all the American resources, soldiers, dollars, and military and civilian articles they demand.

This Charter makes permanent the present policy of giving England and Russia all our military secrets and control of our military defenses. Your common sense should warn you that surrendering our military and economic independence to these two imperialistic governments can only bring you increasing want and war.

Look at enslaved Poland and India. Look at those who have been

leading the fight for this un-American program. They are the same people who dragged us step by step into the present war, while pretending that their purpose was to keep us out of war. By piously promising future peace, these war mongrels, masquerading as Princes of Peace hoped to make you forget that while you were winning this war, your government officials were surrendering your war aims and creating the next world war.

True, Germany and France will have been destroyed—never to rise again, unless England or Russia help build them up the same way they did Hitler. But don't think they won't, because during this war, thanks to American aid, Russia has seized control of Europe and is trying to seize control of governments all over the world.

The British and the Moscow-controlled communists have already clashed in Greece and Yugoslavia. They will probably fight soon in Turkey or other points along the British Empire lifeline, and the United States acts as arsenal, furnishing equipment for both sides in this growing Third World War.

If the American people really want to prevent war, and I know they do, they must insist that our Government do exactly the opposite of this proposed program. Our Government must stop giving aid to foreign governments unconditionally and give it only on condition that they stop enslaving people and governments and stop creating wars.

And we must immediately bring

our Army home from Europe, because the presence of our Army in Europe encourages those who are trying to precipitate immediate war against Russia, who hope with good reason, that once more, as twice before in our lifetime, our Government will go to war to preserve the British Empire.

Bringing our men home would not interfere with the bombing now burning out Japan. It would not delay the invasion of Japan nearly so long as the ruinous war against Russia now likely to start at any time.

The artificially generated celebration over the San Francisco Conference sounds like the celebration over the hypocritical Munich conference which started World War II. It also sounds suspiciously like an attempt to divert public attention from the still more dangerous step in their program, the Bretton Woods bill, soon to be passed by the Senate.

That bill surrenders to Russia and other foreign governments billions of dollars we know in advance will be used for their imperialistic wars. It surrenders power enough to create unlimited billions of dollars the same way our banking system creates dollars and they can use those dollars to buy unlimited quantities of American goods, draining the United States. It surrenders power enough to impose economic sanctions, power to create booms and depressions the way our Federal Reserve Bank, through money manipulation, created the 1927 stock market boom and the 1929 crash. It sur-

renders power enough to make economic slaves of the American people.

You are going to learn from sad experience that by international cooperation they mean international communism and continual war.

If you value your country and your own skins, you will rise up and demand that your leaders throw this program into the same wastebasket where they threw the Atlantic Charter. Bring our Army home from Europe immediately. Stop buying more war. Use our money to buy peace. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Walsh:

Thank you, Representative Sumner. Now the future peace of the world is of obvious paramount importance to the men and women who are fighting this war. So we've got a special event, albeit a short one, tonight. There are two GI's on the stage in this colorful auditorium and we're going to hear briefly what these two typical GI's think about this subject. First, Sergeant Bert Briller. Mr. Briller is editor of the *Mitchel Field Beacon*. Sergeant Briller. (*Applause.*)

Sergeant Briller: I disagree with Representative Sumner for many reasons. Every day here at Mitchel Field planes bring back wounded GI's from Europe. I have met these men, talked with them, shared their experiences, know their thinking. These wounded men don't complain about sacrifices, but each of them desperately and fervently says, "We don't want this to happen again. We don't want our

kids to go through what we went through."

These wounded men placed their hopes for a future peace in the San Francisco Charter. They know what Walter Lippmann meant when he wrote, "Asking the question, 'Will the Charter work?' is like asking 'Will a B-29 fly to Guam?'" The answer is, 'A B-29 will fly to Guam, if the men in the crew work as a team, if they get the support of the men on the ground.'"

The machinery of the Charter is sound and will work if every citizen of every nation will take an interest in foreign affairs and try to understand the people and politics of foreign nations. This is "one world," Representative Sumner, and poverty in Europe will affect America just as depressions in America will spread to the rest of the world. Depressions breed war. That is why we must ban emergencies everywhere, ban them by working together with other nations through the Charter and its economic counterparts. In that way, we definitely can make the Charter guarantee world peace. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Walsh:

Thank you, Sergeant Briller. Now we have another sergeant from Mitchel Field. Let's hear from him on the other side. Sergeant Irving Lent.

Sergeant Lent: Of course, Sergeant Briller, we all want peace. Every soldier and every citizen is searching for a way to end war and to bring about world peace. There are many weaknesses, at the moment, in the San Francisco

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

J. RAYMOND WALSH—Mr. Walsh was born in Beloit, Wisconsin, in 1901. He received an A.B. degree from Beloit College in 1921. For the next four years he taught American History in the Merrill (Wis.) High School. The next year he attended Chicago Musical College. From 1926 to 1929 he was assistant principal of the Appleton (Wis.) schools. From 1930 to 1937, Mr. Walsh was an instructor in economics at Harvard and during this time received his Ph.D. from the same school.

After a year as trial examiner for the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D.C., and another year spent in writing and lecturing, Mr. Walsh became chairman of the department of economics and sociology and professor of economics at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, New York. In 1914, he went to Williams College in Williamstown, Mass., as professor of economics.

Mr. Walsh is now research director for the C.I.O. Political Action Committee. He is the author of *CIO, Industrial Unionism in Action* and of *Explorations in Economics*.

WALTER H. JUDD—Walter Judd, Republican Congressman from Minnesota, was a medical missionary and hospital superintendent in China for a number of years (1925-31 and 1934-38), under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He was born in Rising City, Nebraska, and received his B.A. and M.D. degrees from the University of Nebraska. In 1918 he enlisted in the United States Army and served in the Field Artillery.

In 1923 he received his medical degree and not long after went to China. During a furlough in the United States he had a fellowship in surgery at the Mayo Foundation in Rochester, Minnesota (1932-34). Dr. Judd spent 1939 and 1940 speaking throughout the United States in an attempt to arouse Americans to the menace of Japan's military expansion and to get embargo established on the sale and shipment of war materials to Japan. At the time of his election to Congress, Dr. Judd was conducting a private medical practice in Minneapolis.

ELY CULBERTSON—Well known for the Culbertson System of bridge rules, Ely Culbertson has also become known for his system for world federation and peace.

Born in Rumania in 1891, he was the son of a Scottish-American father (an American citizen) and a Cossack mother.

Culbertson's youth in Russia not only included the pleasures of a wealthy playboy, but imprisonment in a czarist prison and revolutionary activities. Sent to America, he was enrolled at Yale but he soon dropped out to see more of American life. After roaming the world for several years, he returned to Europe where he attended L'Ecole des Sciences Economiques et Politiques in Paris, and later the University of Geneva.

Mr. Culbertson's extremely full and adventurous life can best be read in his autobiography, *The Strange Lives of One Man* (1940). His other books include many on the subject of bridge. He is the editor of *Bridge World Magazine*, president of The Bridge World, Inc., the Kem Playing Card Company, and Culbertson National Studios, New York.

During the past few years Mr. Culbertson has devoted much thought to post-war planning. His plans are set forth in *Summary of the World Federation Plan*, *The World Federation Plan*, and *Total Peace*.

CARL A. HATCH—Senator Carl Hatch, Democrat of New Mexico, was born in Kirwin, Kansas, in 1889. With a LL.B. from Cumberland University, he began the practice of law in Eldorado, Oklahoma, in 1912. In 1916, he moved to Clovis, New Mexico. The following year he served as assistant attorney general of New Mexico and from 1923 to 1929 he was district judge of the 9th Judicial District. Returning to Clovis, he continued his practice of law until 1933 when he was appointed United States Senator to fill the unexpired term of Sam G. Bratton.

JESSIE SUMNER—A native of Milford, Illinois, Miss Sumner has been a member of the United States House of Representatives since 1939. With an A.B. from Smith College, Miss Sumner has also studied at the Columbia Law School, University of Chicago Law School, Oxford University in England, New York University, and the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce.

Miss Sumner has practiced law in Chicago and served as county judge of Iroquois County. She is a director of the Sumner National Bank of Sheldon, Ill.

Charter, and it might not be the panacea which its supporters hope it to be.

As a matter of fact, Sergeant Briller, what B-29 can fly to Guam if it doesn't have a motor, or if it

doesn't have fuel? All of the co-operation in the world won't get it to Guam without a motor or fuel.

There are many weaknesses in this Charter. For instance, it freezes the existing inequalities among nations. Mr. Culbertson estimates that 15 years from now Russia will have a population of 500,000,000 people, far greater resources, and much greater military might than the United States. If 15 years from now we still have this inflexible Charter, it might make it necessary to start over—to start over from scratch and to begin to develop world organization once more.

I think the best thing we can say about the San Francisco Charter is that it is a step in the right direction. That means we are willing to think about peace and we are willing to make a genuine effort to prevent another world war.

If the San Francisco Charter is to have meaning to the average citizen, it must be much more concerned with the freedoms of peoples everywhere and the guarantee of the rights and opportunities which humanity demands, but, as every soldier knows, one step isn't a march.

If we are to realize the dreams of our late Commander-in-Chief, President Roosevelt, we must undertake a longer march—a march which leads to a sounder charter and greater assurance of world peace. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Walsh: Thank you, Sergeant Lent. Now, we've had a question phoned in to us by a dis-

tinguished writer, Louis Fischer. I'm going, just before the station break, to ask this question to whom it is directed, namely, Senator Hatch. Senator Hatch, will you come up to the microphone a moment?

Mr. Fischer asks, "After the Senate ratifies the San Francisco Charter, as I hope it will soon, what can the world organization do to lessen the existing rivalry between England, Russia, and the United States in Europe and Asia?" Senator Hatch?

Senator Hatch: Briefly as I can, I want to say first that every agency proposed in the Charter will be available to lessen the very rivalries of which Mr. Fischer speaks—not only rivalries but the age old jealousies, hatreds, and suspicions which have always bred war, and without some instrument for peace, will always breed war. If the question is a military one, the Security Council will act if the peace is threatened. If it involves social or economic questions, the Social and Economic Council will act. If it is a matter involving law, the International Court will preside and apply principals of law and justice and not the rule of might and force.

Moderator Walsh: Thank you, very much, Senator Hatch. I think that was a difficult and comprehensive question. Now, Miss Sumner and you gentlemen, if you will come up to the microphone here and join me, we are going to get into a little huddle for the benefit of the audience and those on the air, but before we do that

we'll pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of questions vitally important to you, sponsored by the most widely read of all magazines, *The Reader's Digest*. For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period immediately following, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Enclose ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Now, our guest moderator, for this evening, radio commentator Raymond Walsh. Mr. Walsh.

Mr. Walsh: I'm surrounded by brains here that are just electrifying me. I'm going into a little conversation between these four participants in the program and Mr. Culbertson, I see a question springing to your lips.

Mr. Culbertson: Dr. Judd, you said that we cannot condone many of the things being done by our Allies but in accepting this Charter, are we not in reality putting on the stamp of our approval?

Congressman Judd: It could be interpreted that way, I think, Mr. Culbertson, but I don't believe that it necessarily means that. I think we have a good object lesson from our own history.

When the proposal came along for the North and the South to unite in forming this Nation, there were Abolitionists up in New England who said, "Why we can't go in with the South—their economy is based on slavery. We'd be bless-

ing, we'd be putting the stamp of our approval, we'd be endorsing a system of slavery with which we are unalterably opposed, therefore we must not have anything to do with it."

But that really wasn't the wise thing to do and in the end they decided to go in because inside maybe they could gradually modify those things to which they were opposed in the direction of greater justice whereas on the outside they couldn't do anything. So I believe the same sort of thing holds today.

However, let me say this—when the North did go in with the South, that didn't mean that they, therefore, gave up their opposition to slavery — it was still wrong. They were still against slavery. I am still against some of those things, but that doesn't mean I have to go to war with them. I still can play ball in the hope we can change those in the direction of greater justice.

Mr. Walsh: Miss Sumner, I wonder if you have anything to say in rebuttal to Mr. Judd?

Congresswoman Sumner: Yes, We have spent all the time up to now without ever fighting England and Russia, and we never should have to fight them if we don't go into this organization. But if we don't like it, the only way we can get out of it is a civil war, just as the South had to get out of a civil war. There's nothing in the Charter that permits the states to get out.

Mr. Walsh: Are you satisfied

with the answer to your question, Mr. Culbertson?

Mr. Culbertson: Miss Sumner, I think I should bring up one thing which is very important in connection with this question. I can conclude from your talk, at the beginning and now, that the war we've been fighting against Hitler and the war we are fighting now against Hirohito is in vain. I must make it very clear about this point, in case there be any possible misunderstanding, that if I understood you to say so or imply, I don't believe it. I think there is not a single American life that has been lost in vain. There is not one single American wounded, one single sacrifice that has been lost in vain.

We could never have afforded to permit these four hundred million Europeans to be organized under the dictatorship of one single man, be it a Hitler, a Churchill, or a Stalin. Therefore, so far all of these sacrifices have not been vain. On the other hand, we must complete the job and win the peace in the best way we know how. I hope you didn't mean that, Miss Sumner.

Congresswoman Sumner: Well, here, you're not supposed to trump your partner's ace. You must not be the bridge expert you are advertised to be. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. Walsh: Well, here's a case with some cross currents in this program. Senator Hatch, I wonder if you have any question to ask any of the other participants.

Senator Hatch: Yes, I did want

to ask, because I am not quite clear from the discussion that has gone on, do our worthy opponents argue that we should reject the Charter in its entirety? And, if so, what do you offer in lieu of it?

Mr. Culbertson: Are you asking me, Senator Hatch?

Senator Hatch: No, sir.

Mr. Culbertson: Well, Miss Sumner, will you please take the floor? That's a very good question. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. Walsh: Come on up, Miss Sumner. What do you think of that.

Congresswoman Sumner: I've already told you. Bring the army home from Europe. That will prevent the immediate war with Russia in which British and United States will be fighting against Russia. Second, stop giving lend-lease and other aid unconditionally. Give American aid on condition, and only on condition, that the governments receiving it really liberate the people they have been taking over in the places left vacant by Hitler.

Senator Hatch: My only thought is, is that your answer to the question, Miss Sumner?

Congressman Sumner: That is my answer.

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Culbertson?

Mr. Culbertson: Senator Hatch, I have an answer, too, but I think the time is short, and we'd better go on to the next question. My answer is obvious from my introductory speech.

Mr. Walsh: All right. We will go on to the next question. I see

that Mr. Judd is very restless here and wants to ask somebody a question. Mr. Judd.

Congressman Judd: I'd like to ask Mr. Culbertson who he thinks is to blame for the failures, as he outlines them, of the San Francisco Conference and Charter?

Mr. Culbertson: I lay the principal blame for the failures of the San Francisco Charter on the moral defeatism of most of our leadership in all walks of life and in all parties. Most of our leaders have faith neither in the American people, nor in their own capacity to win the great peace now. I'm a native American, brought up largely abroad. I look upon my native land, not only from the inside looking out, as most of you, but from the outside looking in.

I'm astonished and heartbroken at the moral defeatism which I witnessed in San Francisco. There the United States, led by the incompetence of the State Department and fed by the moral defeatism of the leadership, abandoned one principle after another, adopted one appeasement after another until nothing was left but the terrifying prospect of a Third

World War. What the United States should have done in San Francisco was to produce a plan of world security that would be both effective and just, and throw this plan on the table of history on the basis of take it or leave it.

If adopted without amendments, the hopeless structure of the Charter will quickly show it up for what it really is—a cardboard league. Then I hope it will not be too late for the American Nation to build on the imperishable foundation of Wilson's noble ideal—and I mean Wilson's, Miss Sumner—a true house of peace.

Mr. Walsh: Senator Hatch, have you anything to say in reply to Mr. Culbertson?

Senator Hatch: Yes, I want to know what's going to happen if we have no Charter at all.

Mr. Walsh: Well, I think we will close off this little huddle here, because we've got a very good audience here of Air Force WACS, pilots, bombardiers, navigators, gunners, and ground crews, and they have questions, I'm sure—I hope a lot of questions—to direct at all four of our distinguished participants.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Walsh: Questions now please from the audience. Here's a question down in front. Will you come forward and give the question?

Lady: My question is directed to Representative Sumner. In reference to your remark about our giving England military secrets and

resources, is it not true that we pooled our military secrets in order to win the war, and that the British Empire has given us back at least half the lend lease that we gave to her, and that the British Empire had more casualties than we had?

Congresswoman Sumner: It's not

true they have had more casualties than we have, as far as I know. I know that we've furnished 80 percent of the invasion forces and replacements. I don't know how many secrets they've given us. There's no way of knowing. But, I do know that Russia has not given us any of their military secrets.

Mr. Walsh: All right, Miss Sumner. Thank you very much. There's a question down here.

Soldier: I'd like to ask Senator Hatch a question. How will the Charter stop aggression on the part of one of the Big Five nations?

Senator Hatch: You assume by that that if one of the Big Five actually takes an aggressive step, then having the power of veto, what could the other powers do? That question has been debated on this very program. The answer is obvious: If one of the big powers actually commits aggression, World War III has already begun.

Mr. Walsh: I see Mr. Culbertson would like to come in on that question. Mr. Culbertson?

Mr. Culbertson: The argument—and I think that is a very wrong argument—is that if any of these five powers decides to make war and violate the agreement there's going to be a war anyway. It is like arguing that we don't need any policeman nor do we need any judge, because if the gangsters want to hold up the bank, they are going to hold up the bank. But the point is not that they will hold up the bank, the point is, will they get away with holding up the bank. The point is, will we allow

the gangsters to be rearmed all over the world with thousands and thousands of guns and tanks? That is a fallacy.

Mr. Walsh: Here's Miss Sumner, right before the microphone. We'll give you a minute on this, Miss Sumner.

Congresswoman Sumner: To me the point is that the United States today is the strongest nation in the world, has inexhaustible resources, all the materials, all the military sources, and what you're doing is letting the gangsters right in to participate in your police force and control it. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Walsh: Thank you, very much. Now we have a question down here in the audience. A GI.

Soldier: Congressman Judd. How will the Big Five prevent another war? What actual action could they take?

Congressman Judd: There are several things they can take to prevent another war. Beginning way back in the Social and Economic Council, so much of the debate on this Charter has centered around the Security Council, when as a matter of fact, if we make the Assembly and Social and Economic Council work, the need for the Security Council gradually and increasingly diminishes. However, the Security Council is pledged, whenever it sees a situation developing which might conceivably lead to war, to begin action immediately and, with mediation and negotiation and arbitration, exhaust all the possible measures before it actually takes any forceful steps.

Personally, I would have liked

to see, as Mr. Culbertson has suggested, I would have liked to see come out of San Francisco an organization so clearly based on justice that every nation in the world would know in advance it wouldn't need to go to war to get a satisfaction of its legitimate needs, and on the other hand, with sufficient organized force so that every nation would know in advance it couldn't succeed even if it did go to war.

But we couldn't get that and, therefore, we had to take this which is half a loaf—I admit it. In most cases, I believe we can prevent it. If, in spite of all the effort, they insist on going ahead, I don't know of any possible way to prevent it. But this is our best hope and, therefore, I must try it.

Mr. Walsh: Dr. Judd, you'll be surprised I'm sure that Congresswoman Sumner wishes to speak on that question. Miss Sumner.

Congresswoman Sumner: I'm the only one who is really against it, I think. The General Assembly, if you'll look at the Charter, hasn't any power whatever except that of a debating society. It is like the League of Nations where a democratic screen of respectability was created behind which big powered politics did his business as usual.

Mr. Walsh: Dr. Judd, do you want to say anything on that?

Congressman Judd: Yes. I think if we analyze it we could say this. We could recognize that there is no possibility of peace and security in this world unless there is order. And there's no possi-

bility of an enduring order without justice. And you can't get justice without the machinery of justice which is mutual agreement upon the rules by which we are going to live and courts to interpret them and then a police force—a sheriff. If the sheriff is there, most of the time we don't need him. If he isn't there, of course, you will have to have him.

There are about four ways you could do it. You can do it with alliances. I don't believe it will work for this reason among others, that in an alliance, you pledge to defend the policy of another nation which you had no hand in developing and in a showdown you won't go to its rescue.

The other is the debating society of which Miss Sumner has spoken. It has no real power except the power of ideas.

The third is a compromise and that's what this is. It's a compromise between a forum and an alliance.

I would like the fourth one of which I spoke, a real world organization. But we can't get it. Are we then going to reject, I repeat, the best we can get?

Mr. Walsh: Well, there's a man who wants to reply to you. Mr. Culbertson.

Mr. Culbertson: Congressman Judd, twice you say we can't get it. Why? Aren't we the mightiest and the most peaceful Nation in the world and in history? Why can't we get it when we have sacrificed so much?

But the question I want to ask is this: The whole Dumbarton

Oaks plan is predicated upon the assumption that the three great powers, with their own ideologies, each with their own economies, will be in lasting cooperation. The question is, Congressman Judd, what will happen if these three powers, far from cooperating, will refuse to cooperate with each other in important particulars?

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Judd, you have been asked two or three questions by Mr. Culbertson. I think I'll ask you to try a reply on it, and then we will have another question from the floor.

Congressman Judd: Well, I would like to say this. I believe that the two biggest reasons why we weren't able to get it came from two countries, America and Russia. There is good reason, as you all know, to fear that if we went too far, for example, as the former Governor of my state, Commander Stassen, wanted to go, we couldn't get it through our own Government to say nothing of other governments, and the second that is fearful is Russia.

If you'll permit me a half a minute—I don't hold any brief for Russia, but if we had been invaded by other countries, those now our Allies, only 25 years ago, we'd still be afraid. There are people in this country who have not got over the Civil War—yes, there are people out in my part of the country who haven't got over the Revolutionary War. (*Laughter.*)

Now how can we expect Russia to forget that 25 years ago she was invaded by us and the British and the French. The second thing

is, she had experience with the League of Nations. When Japan broke her covenants, what did they do? They slapped her on the wrist. Italy broke them in Ethiopia. What did they do? Slapped Italy on the wrist. Hitler broke them. What did they do? Slapped him on the wrist. Then Russia came along and broke them when she went into Finland. What did they do with Russia? Slap her on the wrist? No, they kicked her in the teeth, clear out. So she's afraid. If there were three or four other countries on her side, probably she wouldn't insist so absolutely on the veto. While I don't agree with her and I wish she hadn't taken that position, still I recognize that there are historical fears and suspicions which, for the present, until we develop better relations, make it impossible to get the thing that you and I both want, Mr. Culbertson. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Walsh: Now I see a question in the back of the room.

Lady: I have a question for Mr. Culbertson. Do you think Russia will keep her part in the Charter if she becomes a nation of 500,000,000 people, and more powerful than the United States?

Mr. Culbertson: The question is, if I can hear it well, do I think that Russia will keep her part of the bargain if she will be a nation of 500,000,000 and more powerful than we are? That's the question. First of all, I must clear up a misunderstanding. Russia proper will be, 20 years from now, 250,000,000, because her population today is 190,000,000. Russia grows at

the rate of 3,000,000 net a year. But in addition to these 250,000,000, if we permit the establishment of spheres of influences in eastern Europe, in communistic China, and Middle East, she will have 5,000,000,000.

Now the answer is, nobody can say whether, when Stalin and his realistic group are gone, Russia will keep her part of the bargain or not. This is not important. We Americans cannot entrust the destiny of our Nation, the whole generations of future children of America, even when a nation might break her promise. Therefore, in a world of power politics and in a world of balance of power, we must always assume that no nation will keep her part of the bargain at some more or less future time.

Mr. Walsh: Miss Sumner, we'll give you thirty seconds on that.

Congresswoman Sumner: Well, I was just going to ask Mr. Culbertson if he didn't think there were plenty of power politics at San Francisco. It seemed to me that all the little nations were voting as puppets of the three big powers.

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Culbertson, ten seconds.

Mr. Culbertson: In ten seconds I say, yes, plenty of power politics—too much.

Mr. Walsh: All right. I'm very sorry to have to cut off at a very interesting point.

Now while the speakers are preparing to summarize this evening's discussion, America's Town Meeting and *The Reader's Digest* are honored to present a very distin-

guished guest, the wife of a great American general and a woman who has endeared herself to thousands of our war wounded through her untiring efforts in Army convalescent hospitals, Mrs. Jimmy Doolittle. (*Applause.*)

Mrs. Doolittle: Normally, I do not discuss hospital experiences. But tonight, I have a story I have permission to give to you. A couple of months ago I visited a hospital where there was a boy who had lost both of his arms. He was very courageous about his loss insofar as it affected him personally, but he was badly depressed at the thought of breaking the news to the girl that he had hoped to marry. He had even ignored her letters by way of forcing her to forget him.

A kind, wise nurse happened to hear of the matter. She discouraged the breaking off with his former sweetheart. She even offered to write his letters for him—letters that he no longer had the hands to write, and she did more. She helped to tell the girl about his misfortune and gently, but steadily, gave him confidence that finally led him to propose by mail.

When I made a return trip to the same hospital recently, I was delighted to hear that a wedding had just taken place. Yes, the boy had married the girl and you can imagine how grateful they both were to the nurse who had done so much.

My husband, Jimmy, has the greatest admiration for our nurses.

He said to me, "Army nurses are wonderful." He has seen them working under harrowing pressure. He told me how very comforting it is for the servicemen to know that more and more girls are signing up enthusiastically in the Cadet Nurse Corps. He thinks it is splendid that so many are taking advantage of this training that produces women who can do their work, not just efficiently but magnificently.

A hundred and twelve thousand Cadet Nurses are already serving their country, helping to relieve the overbusy nurses in military hospitals, helping in civilian hospitals to free nurses for military services. Yet, 60,000 more Cadet Nurses are still needed.

Every healthy young woman between 17 and 35, who is a high school graduate, is eligible to join the United States Cadet Nurse Corps. If you qualify, all-expense scholarships are now available. In return for this free lifelong education, you only have to pledge that you'll remain in essential nursing for the duration.

So I hope you will apply immediately for summer or fall courses. Go to your local hospital or write to the United States Public Health Service, Box 88, New York, New York. You'll be doing yourself and your country a great service. Thank you and bless you. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Walsh: Thank you, Mrs. Jimmy Doolittle. It was a great honor to have you with us here tonight. Now for the summaries

of tonight's discussion we hear first from Ely Culbertson.

Mr. Culbertson: I think there are three people on this platform who believe that this is "one world" as one of our great Americans believed and who believed not only must we trust and build our security upon our own strength but also upon a world order that makes sense. One person—a very charming lady—believes that our greatest trust must be in our country and who does not believe in a world of power politics and in an international organization that is a screen for politics.

We are all Americans. Miss Sumner may be called a nationalist. We may be called internationalists, but we must remember that there are millions and millions of Americans who are nationalistically inclined, who are determined that this time the world shall not cheat the United States. There are millions and millions of other Americans who are internationally inclined, who are determined that this time the United States shall not cheat the world. We must find a common bridge to satisfy all the patriotic Americans—be they nationalists or internationalists—so that the United States may be ever safe.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you, very much, Mr. Culbertson. Now a final summary from Senator Carl Hatch. Senator Hatch.

Senator Hatch: We on the affirmative assert the Charter is a good Charter—not perfect but workable if the nations of the

world have the will to make it work. It is the only proposal before us. Amendments and reservations will only delay, confuse and, perhaps, kill and destroy.

We must accept the Charter. May this great country which has sacrificed so much on the altars of war, make some contribution, some sacrifice for peace.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you, Senator Hatch, Ely Culbertson, and Representatives Jessie Sumner and Walter Judd for an enlightening and provocative discussion.

We will be deeply interested also, I'm sure, in next week's subject when the question of universal peacetime military training will be discussed under the title, "Should We Have Universal Military Training After the War?"

Dr. Edward C. Elliott, president of Purdue University, and Burgess Meredith, film star and former captain of the U. S. Air Corps, will take the affirmative. Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican of Ohio, and Dr. Felix Morley, president of Haverford College, and former editor of the *Washington Post*, will uphold the negative.

Now may I thank America's Town Hall for a great experience, for I greatly enjoyed acting as a guest moderator tonight in Mr. Denny's absence.

Announcer: Next week, our guest moderator will be H. V. Kaltenborn, the famous radio commentator. So plan to listen in next Thursday and every Thursday for the sound of the crier's bell.

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW

Should the Government Assure Jobs?

By CHARLES E. MARTZ

The subject outlined in this preview is to our best knowledge the one which will be used on Town Meeting of the Air, Thursday evening, July 12, 1945. However, in view of the rapidity of wartime developments there is always a possibility that another topic which seems more urgent may be substituted.

To get to the bottom of the postwar employment question, we must avoid being enticed into quibbles over terms. "Jobs for all" is, of course, subject to limitations. There will always be a sizable number of individuals who cannot take jobs or who don't want to hold jobs. There will always be "frictional unemployment" as workers are temporarily idle while moving from one job to another. "Jobs for all" must be construed sensibly to mean jobs for

the overwhelming majority of those who are able and willing to work.

Moreover, it probably will not be too profitable to argue over the exact number of jobs that will be needed. "Sixty thousand jobs for Americans" expresses a general goal, whether the exact number will be 53 thousand, 57 thousand, or more.

The Problem — The postwar problem is fairly clear. In 1944 we reached a peak during which

some 55,000,000 Americans were gainfully employed. This figure does not include those in the armed forces.

Already, cutbacks are reducing that labor force. The movement will accelerate as the Japanese war comes to its end. Some 10,000,000 men and women in uniform will return to enter the job market.

Unemployment insurance and the \$300 (maximum) payment to discharged servicemen will cushion the shock to a slight extent. But our problem is clear. Industry must be reconverted quickly, where such reconversion is possible. Production must be stepped up beyond anything that we have known if all those wanting jobs are to have them. Our question is clear: By what means should we bring about this end?

For our answer we may look in one of two directions:

The problem may be left in the hands of private industry, with little or no Government action, or

The Government may be engaged actively, according to some such plan as that written in the Murray-Kilgore bill.

Some Underlying Considerations

—Those who are trying to think their way through this difficult problem may well check the validity of a few facts and theories that have been advanced.

Jobs for all means huge production. Huge production means huge consumption, for business cannot continue to produce unless its product is bought and con-

sumed. The greatest consuming power is found in the 39,000,000 families whose incomes are an annual \$5,000 or less. The incomes of this group must be kept at a high level if we are to have a market for full production. Is industry able and willing to increase the share of total income which goes to these purchasers? Can we have full consumption, and thus full employment, unless this is done?

Will quick reconversion provide the solution to unemployment? Unfortunately conversion is not possible in some mammoth industries. Shipbuilding will practically cease. Airplane construction will probably go down more than 85 percent. The machine-tool industry has done such a good job that our requirements will be met for a long period. The explosive industry will practically come to a dead end. The end of plane manufacture will remove most of the expanded market for aluminum and some other metals.

How soon will other industries take up this serious slack? There is a report that the railroads will enter few orders for new equipment until six months after the war. The same "wait and see" attitude is evident in other industries. That is, after all, good business. But it will not promote full employment in the period immediately after the war.

Will wartime savings bring a consumption — and production — boom? Mention of a possible 225 billion dollars in savings ready for postwar buying of radios, auto-

mobiles, and other commodities does not tell the whole story. This fabulous figure includes the prewar nest eggs accumulated by millions. It includes the new insurance policies. It includes the savings of those with higher incomes. There is little hope that these sums will be thrown into the buying spree that is visualized by some.

The great buying public is centered in the families with incomes of \$5,000 or less. There are 39,000,000 of these, and it is estimated that their savings are about \$40,000,000,000. Unless these people see immediate prosperity in the offing, they are not going to spend their savings on gadgets. A recent survey showed that most farmers are determined to buy new equipment out of income rather than out of savings. Savings may not be the answer to our question, unless full employment comes quickly. Spending may be the result of full employment rather than the cause of it.

Will foreign trade play a big part? Economists suggest that foreign trade is fraught with danger unless we import in considerable amounts. The consumption problem, then, is not solved by exports for which we receive imports.

These propositions indicate the complexity of the problem. There are many who want to emphasize the seriousness of the situation—the danger to world economy unless the United States avoids a new depression, the danger inherent in the attitude of returned servicemen who will not be in a mood to

stand in line waiting for jobs or to sell apples.

All of which does not touch the specific question of this Town Meeting program. Should the Government enter the arena? It is obvious that action by Government cuts down the liberty of action by individuals, and we want to retain as much as possible of our personal freedom. Most Americans will agree that Government should intervene only when private industry fails to accomplish the essential end of providing employment.

The nub of the question is in that statement. Can private industry do the job? Can it overcome the obstacles, some of which have been suggested above? Can it take the chances that will be necessary if employment is not delayed too long, or even found to be impossible? Which is more important for America—freedom of industry to operate freely under the laws of supply and demand, or jobs for all through government action even though it means a curtailment of freedom? Is it possible to reconcile the two tendencies?

One more point of view should be suggested. Those who oppose the "guarantee" of jobs to all call attention to the practical side of the matter. Programs for accomplishing this desirable end are, must be admitted, largely in the area of the unexplored. An interesting discussion might result if the question were interpreted to read, "Can the Government guarantee jobs for all?"